

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 6, 11-13, 15, 18, 21, 22, 26, 27, 39, and 40 are pending for examination.

Claims 6, 11, 18, 21, 26, and 27 are amended.

Claims 6, 11-13, 15, 18, 21, 22, 26, 27, 39, and 40 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

1. Previous rejection of claims 1, 8, 19, 20, 30, and 33 is moot in view of cancelled claims. Further argument and amendment was discussed in interview dated 13 October 2010, and further in interview dated 28 October 2010.

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

2. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Matthew Gage (Reg. 63,059) on 28 October 2010.

The application has been amended as follows, based on last filed claims dated 29 October 2010:

3. Claim 18 has been amended as follows:

A system comprising:

a management interface to receive a command that specifies an export limit;

a network device comprising at least a processor and a control unit that limits a number of routes exported from an external routing protocol executing on a network device to an interior routing protocol executing on the network device in accordance with the export limit; and

a plurality of instances of the interior routing protocol executing on the system,
wherein the control unit separately limits the number of routes exported to each of the instances,

wherein the control unit includes a plurality of prefix counters to maintain respective counts for the number of routes exported to each of the instances, and

wherein the control unit identifies an instance of the interior routing protocol to which routes were exported, accesses the respective prefix counter to compare the stored count with an associated prefix limit, and when the stored count exceeds the associated prefix limit, operates the network device in an overload condition in which the control unit of the network device: (i) updates routing information of the identified instance of the interior routing protocol to clear the routes previously exported from the exterior routing protocol, (ii) rebuilds the routing information of the identified instance of the interior routing protocol by updating the routing information of the identified instance of the interior routing protocol to set a maximum metric that defines a maximum distance for the interior routes of the identified instance of the interior routing protocol from the network device to neighboring network devices, and (iii) advertises the updated routing information to another network device,

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 6, 11, 12, 15, 18, 21, 22, 26, 27, 39, and 40 are allowed.
5. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

6. The closest prior art cited is Pesce (US 2003/0231587) and Sankaran (US 7 554 930).

Pesce discloses a method comprising routes exported from an exterior routing protocol executing on a network device to an interior routing protocol executing on the network device, maintaining routes exported from the exterior routing protocol executing on the network device to the interior routing protocol executing on the network device, and blocking routes exported from the exterior routing protocol to the interior routing protocol, updating routing information to associate the routes with a maximum metric that defines a maximum distance from the network device to neighboring network devices, and advertising the updated routing information to a network device. Sankaran discloses a method for managing discard algorithms comprising maintaining a count of routes exported and rejecting additional routes exported when the count exceeds the export limit set command.

7. The prior art of record does not teach alone or reasonably suggest in combination all of the limitations together within independent claims 11, 18, or 27 (and by incorporation, the claims dependent thereon). For example, independent claim 1 contains the limitations receiving at a network device an export limit command from a client; counting, in response to the export limit command, a number of routes exported from an exterior routing protocol process executing on a processor of the network device to an interior routing protocol process executing on the network device; and when the number of routes exported from the exterior routing protocol process to the interior routing protocol process exceeds an export limit, operating the network device in an overload condition in which the processor of the network device: (i) updates routing information of the interior routing protocol to clear the routes previously exported from the exterior routing protocol, (ii) rebuilds the routing information of the interior routing protocol by updating the

Art Unit: 2444

routing information of the interior routing protocol to set a maximum metric that defines a maximum distance for the interior routes from the network device to neighboring network devices, and (iii) advertises the updated routing information to another network device. Neither reference discloses nor reasonably suggests, either alone or in combination with other prior art of record, all of the limitations present in independent claims 11, 18, or 27. Pesce generally teaches a method of importing routes within a routing device, the routes being of either an interior or exterior routing protocol. Sankaran generally teaches a method of rejecting imported routes to a device table based on a setting of a maximum limit. Neither reference teaches nor suggests the limitations recited in claims 11, 18, or 27. Therefore, independent claims 11, 18, and 27 contains allowable subject matter and are allowable, along with their associated dependent claims.

8. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled “Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance.”

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THOMAS RICHARDSON whose telephone number is (571) 270-1191. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8am-5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on (571) 272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TR
/WILLIAM C VAUGHN JR/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit